

Electrical fields pervade the body and, since man's nervous system carries electrochemical impulses, interaction, that might be felt by some people, is not illogical. There has been no reason for man in his million year evolution to develop the capacity to perceive electrical energy—he needed only to perceive ordinary light and sound waves—but the ability could well be there in latent form.

Does the Mrs G effect have any bearing on Novomeysky's hypothesis which seeks to explain finger-tip vision by suggesting that the surfaces of various colours have different electrostatical charges discernible by touch? (see p. 415).

G. W. F.

CORRESPONDENCE

The Crookes Controversy

SIR,—The following statement appears on the title page of *Proceedings*, 54, Part 195, March 1964:

'The authors are indebted to Mr Mostyn Gilbert for having suggested this project, and for having carried out investigations in connection with it. He wishes it to be known, however, that he does not necessarily concur in the present authors' interpretation of the evidence and reserves the right to publish his own interpretation.

'Note: References to some of the original material found by the authors in the course of their researches and originating in the files of the Society have appeared recently in various publications. The Society wishes it to be understood that this was done without the consent either of the authors or of the Society.'

During the course of my investigations with the authors of the above-mentioned *Proceedings* (K. M. Goldney and R. G. Medhurst) I was asked to withdraw as co-author of the proposed report. After considerable controversy I agreed to withdraw as co-author on the understanding that the proper acknowledgment was to be made on the title page of the *Proceedings*. The Council has been given a statement as to my side of the controversy. At no time did I remove files from the Society without permission. Carbon copies of material which was in the D. D. Home collection had been handed to me by my co-authors in the course of our research. At the same time copies of material I had drawn at the British Museum and the College of Psychic Science were handed to my co-authors, so that in the general exchange of information it was difficult to determine who discovered what first.

To the best of my knowledge two long reports have been pub-

lished (which are related to the *Proceedings* under discussion). One article appeared in *Tomorrow* (Autumn 1963) by Mr Trevor Hall, the other, by myself, was published in a series in *Psychic News* (Winter, 1963-4). In both instances, as far as I know, there was no breach of the laws governing copyright, and if there has been a breach, either of copyright or customary acknowledgment, then I, for my part, deeply regret such breach.

MOSTYN GILBERT

The 'Rosalie' Case

SIR,—I welcome Mr R. J. Hastings's letter (*Journal* Sept. 1964) as it echoes the doubts in my own mind concerning the 'Rosalie' case and that of Borley Rectory. The similarity in the technique employed in 'The Spiritualists' and 'Four Modern Ghosts' is obvious; and in the Borley case I have always considered the S.P.R. Report, (Vol. 51 Part 186) to be the worst ever published under the auspices of our Society.

Whilst in general I feel that the re-opening of old case books is often a rather fruitless exercise; in view of the methods of criticism used in 'The Spiritualists' I agree entirely with Mr Hastings that a re-examination of the 'Rosalie' and Borley Rectory cases is indicated. If he has available any evidence so far unheard I certainly think he should have the facilities to give it an airing.

RICHARD K. SHEARGOLD

SIR,—Mr R. J. Hastings's letter about 'Harry Price and the Rosalie Case' came as a welcome breath of clear, fresh air. His thorough research and unbiased conclusions deserve the widest possible hearing. His work on the allegations against Harry Price, with which I have some knowledge, reinforced my own conclusions reached after extensive personal investigation; namely, there is no foundation in the mischievous allegations made against Price and if R. J. Hastings is allowed to be spokesman for Price's defence, I hope that he will call me as a witness.

A. PETER UNDERWOOD

SIR,—I read with perturbation of Mr R. J. Hastings' treatment by Dr E. J. Dingwall (*Journal*, Sept. 1964). Surely he should have honoured Mr Hastings' letter with at least an answer.

I have written a book covering most of the pertinent facts of that enigmatic 'Rosalie' seance which should be published early 1965. Mr R. S. Lambert, Price's closest confidant at the period of the